DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 092 EA 019 073

AUTHOR Miklos, Erwin; Chapman, Donald
TITLE Reflections on Educating Educational Administrators.
PUB DATE 19 Apr 86
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; Administrators; *Cultural Context; Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal State Relationship; Foreign Countries; Geographic Regions; Higher Education; Models; *Organizational Theories; Schools of Education; Social Influences; State Government
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a history of educational administration among Canada's provinces, discusses the status of university preparation programs, and explores theories of formalized and alternative approaches. Before the 1950's, little interest existed in administrators' formal preparation. Consolidation of schools led to graduate programs, but the lack of requirements for preparation and experience indicates the persistence of the provinces' educational jurisdiction. Historically, administrators and teachers first learned on the job; graduate credentials are not yet completely accepted. Because leadership resides with the ministry and the district, administrators have few opportunities to initiate changes. The importance of schools' geographical and social contexts are not apparent to those observing this limited progress. To formulate a perspective on educating administrators within Canadian cultural contexts, four paradigms illustrate the consequences of preparation programs adopting formalized or alternative approaches. Formalized preservice training emerges within a functionalist paradigm, which delegates administrator control over the organization. The tradition of training following practice is compatible with alternative paradigms--interpretive, radical structuralist, radical humanist--that hold flexible conceptions. This analysis finds no cause for alarm concerning Canada's slow pace of administrator education. Cultural contexts should precede professional ideologies in program design. Forty-three endnotes are included. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Miklos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED278092

REFLECTIONS ON EDUCATING EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Erwin Miklos and Donald Chapman

University of Alberta

Paper Prepared for the Symposium

on

International Perspectives on Administrator Preparation

Annual Meeting of the

American Educational Research Association

San Francisco April 19, 1986

EA 019 073

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFLECTIONS ON EDUCATING EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Erwin Miklos and Donald Chapman

University of Alberta

In this paper we sketch briefly how university-based programs for the study of educational administration were initiated in Canada. We then examine the extent to which formal preservice preparation is currently required as a condition for entry into administrative positions in the various provinces. The limited extent to which this has occurred prompts an examination of possible reasons for the slow diffusion of the belief that administrators require specialized training. Some tentative explanations are found in the historical, structural and cultural context of educational administration in Canada. We move then to an examination of the conceptual basis for advocating specialized preservice preparation and speculate about alternative approaches to educating administrators.

Nature of the Perspective

Any effort to describe the state of administrator preparation in Canada and to understand what happens in university departments which offer programs in educational administration is fraught with numerous challenges. Little research has been conducted and little has been written on Canadian educational administration programs.[1] What literature

there is has not been compiled and integrated in any systematic fashion. The more important critical analyses about educational administration which originate in Canada often appear to be prompted by general concerns which are not uniquely Canadian.[2]

Even at the level of basic description, the task is complicated by the variety and diversity in the university programs which provide for the study of educational administration. The diversity reflects the social, linguistic and regional differences which characterize Canada. To present a description which purports to be a representation of what is happening across the country would be to ignore important differences and to leave the impression that there is a Canadian approach to preparing educational administrators. Such an exercise would be misleading to outsiders and unfair to those who value the diversity.[3]

We adopt a more modest, and, hopefully, a more honest approach in this analysis. The perspective is Canadian only insofar as it reflects the understandings of two persons who identify themselves strongly as Canadians. The view is limited in that their experience is restricted to a particular geographic and social setting, namely, the prairie region of Canada. The effect which that particular context has on the analysis is, of course, not clearly evident to those who are immersed in it. To some extent, validity of interpretations rests on a correspondence test which can be performed only by others.

Beginnings of Administrator Education

Before the 1950s there was only limited interest in formal preparation for the practice of educational administration in Canada. Those who wanted to undertake specialized studies did so at universities in the United States; graduate level courses were available at only a few Canadian universities. The expansion of the educational system, the centralization of schools, and the formation of larger units of administration brought an increasing interest in the role of the school superintendent. In the early 1950s this interest resulted in some significant actions by the Canadian Education Association (CEA).[4]

The initiation of developments in administrator preparation appears to have been due to a fortuitous event. As a result of contacting the Kellogg Foundation in order to explore funding for educational research, the CEA learned of the Foundation's interest in educational administration. The inquiry from the CEA came just at the time when the Cooperative Project in Educational Administration was being initiated in the United States. Subsequently, a proposal was submitted asking for assistance to develop good administrative practices and leadership in education.[5] The request was for funds to conduct courses, to develop Canadian instructional materials, and to promote the development of graduate study. Mention was made also of the desirability of designating one university in Canada as the recognized center for studying the administration and supervision of large rural administrative areas.

The CEA-Kellogg Project in Educational Administration was announced in 1952. Major focus of the project was on the

leadership role of the superintendent in the changing context brought on by the centralization of schools. A pilot in-service education course of three week's duration was held for school superintendents from across Canada at the University of Alberta in May-June 1953. In subsequent years, four other courses were held at the University of Alberta and two at the University of Toronto before the CEA Short Course became an annual event at Banff beginning in May, 1960.[6] The course has continued to be held there annually for a quarter of a century under the direction of different universities but with hardly any changes in purpose or format.[7] Although there are numerous provincial and regional inservice activities, the CEA short course is still the only regular national administrator education project.

After the initial Kellogg grant was received, discussions continued on the role of universities in the professional education of school administrators. A second proposal was submitted to the Kellogg Foundation, and in February, 1956 the Foundation announced a five-year grant to the University of Alberta in support of a program which would serve a Canada-wide clientele.[8] The first doctoral candidate began studies in 1956-57 (even before the program was formally established) and graduated in 1958. Since then, approximately 250 doctoral degrees have been awarded at the University of Alberta. Some of these graduates became staff members at other universities as specialized programs in educational administration were developed during the 1960s and 1970s at universities across Canada.[9] By the mid-1970s programs in educational administration were offered

at about thirty Canadian universities. Programs are available at both master's and doctoral levels, and some universities offer a pre-master's diploma in educational administration. Interest in educational administration courses at the diploma and master's levels, as indicated by enrolments, is relatively high.[10]

Administrator Preparation Requirements

The relatively large number of graduate programs which have been established in Canada is not necessarily an indication that there is general acceptance of the concept of formal preservice preparation of educational administrators.[11] Indeed, indications are that university-based studies are still, at best, a desirable rather than an essential stage in the process of becoming an administrator. Whether or not specialized university study in administration is viewed as an an asset may be contingent upon a broad range of factors associated with a particular administrative position. Frequently, simply holding a master's or doctoral degree may be more important than the field in which it was obtained. In addition, in terms of qualifications at the superintendency level, we may only now be shifting to the position at which a doctoral degree is considered to be an asset rather than a liability.

Some of these impressions appear to be supported by the findings of a recent doctoral study conducted at the University of Alberta.[12] In the study, Duncan examined the various provincial certification, preparation and experience requirements for superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals and assistant principals. The results of the survey reveal the

diversity which is consistent with the character of the Canadian educational mosaic. A summary of the certification, preparation and experience requirements for principals and superintendents is presented in Table 1.

As is indicated in the table, only three provinces -- New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba -- require special certificates for principals. Four provinces, including the above three, make specific mention of a B.Ed. degree in statements of requirements for holding a principalship. In those provinces where a degree is required for initial certification, this qualification would be assumed. Only three of the provinces specify a required number of courses in educational administration which ranges from six three-credit courses in New Brunswick to four in Ontario and one in Prince Edward Island.

At the superintendency level, only the province of Ontario requires a special administrator's certificate. In terms of university training requirements for superintendents, three provinces have no specified requirement, three provinces require a B.Ed. degree, three require an M.Ed., and one accepts any master's degree. Of the seven provinces which require some level of university training, only Alberta and Saskatchewan specify an administrative component -- the equivalent of four full-year courses. Three of the five provinces require only the administration courses as specified by the particular M.Ed. program.[13]

A minimum number of years of teaching experience for holding principalships is specified in some provinces. Among these Quebec is the highest with eight years. Only Ontario requires

Table 1

Minimum Certification, Preparation and Experience Requirements for Principals and Superintendents by Province

	Nfld.	N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	P.Q.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.
Principal										
1. Certificate	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
2. Years University	-	-	5	5	4	5	-	-	-	-
3. Degree	-	-	B.Ed.[b]	B.Ed.	B.Ed.	B.Ed.	-	-	-	-
4. Admin. Courses	-	-	6	1	-	4	-	-	-	-
5. Teaching Exp.	-	-	5	4	8	5	-	-	-	-
6. Admin. Exp.	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
7. Courses [a]	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
Superintendent										
1. Certificate	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
2. Years University	6	-	6	-	6	6	-	5	5	6
3. Degree	M.Ed.	-	M.Ed.	-	Master's	M.Ed.	-	B.Ed.	B.Ed.	B.Ed.
4. Admin. Courses	M.Ed.[c]	-	M.Ed.	-	-	M.Ed.	-	8	8	-
5. Teaching Exp.	3	-	5	-	5	7	-	2	5	3
6. Admin. Exp.	2	-	5	-	5	-	-	2	-	4
7. Courses [a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Adapted from Duncan (1985)

Notes:

[a] Non-credit courses which must be completed in order to qualify for certificate

[b] In some provinces, B.Ed. candidates already hold an undergraduate degree

[c] Only those administration courses specified by a particular M.Ed. program are required

prior administrative experience as well as completion of a non-credit course. At the superintendency level, seven of the ten provinces specify a minimum number of years of teaching experience which is highest in Ontario with seven and lowest in Saskatchewan with two. Five provinces specify a minimum number of years of administrative experience ranging from two in Newfoundland and Saskatchewan to five in New Brunswick and Quebec.

The above complex of regulations, or in some case lack thereof, seems to be revealing of two or three considerations germane to this discussion. Clearly, the variations are indicative of the effect of provincial jurisdiction over education. In addition, the situation also indicates that there has been less than wholesale acceptance of graduate degrees as appropriate credentials for school administrators. Of more specific interest is that a requirement for university courses and/or programs of study in educational administration are modest to nonexistent.

The current situation prompts a number of questions about administrator preparation in Canada: " Why has there been such a slow development in recognizing the importance of formal preparation for the practice of educational administration ?" ; "Why has the belief that the study of educational administration is essential to effective performance in administrative roles not become more widespread?"; and, "Why were the aspirations which were implicit in the initiatives of the Canadian Education Association more than three decades ago apparently satisfied so easily?" Underlying all of these is the question of why

administrator preparation has not been more of an issue in Canada in recent years.[14]

Interpretation

The reasons for the limited progress in establishing the importance of specialized preservice preparation for administrators probably are grounded in the historical, cultural and structural features of Canadian education. An adequate examination of these conditions is beyond the scope of this particular paper; however, a limited excursion into the area may serve to test whether more intensive enquiry is warranted. The explanations and analyses which follow are grounded heavily in personal experience, impressions and speculation. Nevertheless, even a modest attempt at interpretation may serve to shed some light on the particular nature of the Canadian experience with the training or preparation of educational administrators.

Structural Considerations

The constitutional provisions which grant the Canadian provinces jurisdiction in matters related to education are, with few exceptions, defended vigorously and interpreted strictly according to the letter of the law. Active and direct involvement by a federal or national agency in matters related to education inevitably raises questions of intrusion into the provincial domain.[15] Cooperation among the provinces on matters of any significance in education, other than defending themselves against the federal government, occurs only rarely. National organizations such as the Canadian Education Association operate

within political and social realities which foster the exchange of ideas but which generally preclude coordinated action on major issues. The involvement of the CEA in the establishment of a center for the study of educational administration at the University of Alberta in the 1950s must be seen as a rare event. The persistence of the annual CEA short course for school superintendents is indicative of the reluctance to modify a national or interprovincial activity which seems to be functioning smoothly.

The Constitution Act, 1867, protects denominational education rights that exist at the time a province joins confederation. In relation to language, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees minority language-education rights, either French or English, where numbers of students warrant the provision of such services. Consequently, as might be anticipated, the educational policy issues which engender national and interprovincial debate are those which relate to language and to religion.[16] Although these issues do have implications for the administration of schools, they have tended to lead more to questions about structure than to concern about the general qualifications of school administrators or the state of administrator preparation. The latter item simply is not on any national agenda. Administrator preparation can be an agenda item only for provincial ministries. For most of the time, the attention of the policy makers is focused on numerous other higher priority items.

At the provincial level, there is a strong tradition of central control over education. Although the responsibility for

numerous operational matters is delegated to the local level, the major opportunities for the exercise of educational leadership reside with the ministry and, to some extent, at the district rather than the school level. In contrast to elected officials, educational administrators have limited opportunities to be the visible initiators of significant changes or reforms. What appears to be expected of administrators is quiet competence in the performance of their duties; a low profile becomes the role. Administrators make their important contributions to education by influencing those who make the public decisions.[17] The relatively low visibility of administrators has limited attention to their training or qualifications.

Historical/Cultural Considerations

The historical context of the development of administrative positions in Canada probably has inhibited the emergence of a mystique about administration which would require specialized preparation. In spite of the advanced state of urbanization, the one-teacher school remains very much a part of living memory.[18] In that context administrative functions, such as they were, were shared by the teacher and the lay school board. Teacher recruitment and selection, maintenance of facilities, and financial operations were school board responsibilities. The teacher was responsible for such "administrative" functions as public relations, pupil personnel services, and curriculum development in their rudimentary forms. Those teachers who could perform the broad range of functions in a one-teacher setting could aspire to the position of a principalship of a multi-

teacher school. For those who were upwardly mobile in the educational system, the work-experience route into administration was clearly evident. Success in one position was a prerequisite to movement into more favored or challenging positions. Administration was learned through experience in an incremental process. Establishing readiness at one position left only manageable amounts to be learned in the next position. Advancement to a senior post such as that of provincially-appointed inspector involved careful selection.[19]

In retrospect, becoming an administrator during much of the history of education in rural Canada was a relatively easy process because administration itself was emergent at various levels of the educational system. When one-teacher schools and teachers who had been socialized to that setting were first brought together in multi-classroom schools, the initial demand or need for administration was rudimentary to say the least. Teachers, for the most part, maintained a high degree of independence and carried on their activities according to the manner in which they were accustomed. A prime task of the principals of the day was to create a single school out of what was in effect a multiple number of schools. The process of school-making brought with it administrative demands which were learned and accepted as part of the job. Indeed, there would have been nowhere to turn for training in how the task was to be accomplished. The processes of school consolidation and establishment of larger districts brought both the necessity and the opportunities for on-the-job learning. For those who were

involved in these challenges, there was little mystique about either what was required in administration or how these skills were to be learned.[20]

Until recently, entry into teaching in Canada has required relatively limited formal preservice preparation.[21] The prevailing pattern of teacher education was to start with a minimal program and to continue with formal education through part-time study or during periods of leave after teaching experience. Many teachers have acquired bachelor's degrees after long years of service in the classroom. This tradition was one in which training or "preparation" followed experience. The formal study was seen to contribute to improved skills along with practice and experience. A similar concept appears to have been extended readily to administrator "training" programs when these were initiated. Not only teaching experience but also some administrative experience was regarded as a desirable prerequisite for undertaking a program of university study.

The structural, historical and cultural factors which have been discussed provide, at best, only a partial explanation of why pre-service preparation of educational administrators has been slow to develop as a concept and as a requirement. To some extent, university departments of educational administration may also have contributed to the slow growth in the implementation of the concept.

Program Considerations

As we have stated, university-based programs in educational administration are a phenomenon of the last three decades.

Initially, two main challenges were faced by these programs. One was to establish credibility within the university; the other to establish credibility with practicing educators. In many respects, the two challenges called for conflicting resolutions. The internal credibility issue called for highly selective student admissions and for program elements which are academically rigorous. The external demand was for ready access, relevance to practice, and flexible arrangements. For the most part, the academic interest has prevailed. Programs have been designed more with the internal than the external critics and constituencies in mind.[22] Progress in responding to the special needs and circumstances of practicing educators has been slow. Where the response has been more rapid, the academic quality of the program has come under question.

A further consideration is that departments of educational administration have not identified themselves closely with prevailing educational issues. During the last few years, educational administrators in Canada have been confronted with developments which led to the introduction of second language programs, integration of the handicapped, community schools, operation of smaller schools, and emphasis on multiculturalism.[23] In addition, there have been administrative changes such as school-based budgeting and local appointment of superintendents.[24] Beyond brief mention in the relevant courses, preparation programs appear to have been largely unaffected by any of these changes. The involvement of departments of educational administration other than in some research on these problems has been minimal. Since university-based programs, for

the most part, have chosen not to address these issues, the relevance of the programs as preparation for the practice of administration remains problematic.[25] Insofar as some of these issues are distinctively Canadian, the preparation programs have not developed a distinctive orientation.[26]

The limited extent to which the study of educational administration can address current issues may reside also, partly, in the diversity of the clientele enrolled in Canadian educational administration programs. Early in their development, the programs began to serve students from a wide variety of backgrounds: different provinces and countries, aspirants for different positions, students with a wide variety of interests in education from early childhood through to both institutional and non-formal adult education. The involvement of these clients in the study of educational administration has enriched programs. However, it has also tended to push conceptualizations and analyses to the highest common multiple of what might be considered important issues. In a program which involves a diverse student group, we can speak of curriculum development as being an important function of administrators but we struggle to find a common ground in terms of specifics. We can say values are important but not which ones or what difference they make. The high level of abstraction in these programs helps to make them academically acceptable and appropriate for a broad range of clients. However, this reduces their ability to serve as preparation for a specific field or position. Instead, they serve more as a general orientation and continuing education

function than as preservice preparation.

As a final aspect of program considerations, in terms of their basic orientation departments of educational administration seem to have set themselves apart from other areas of educational studies by allowing the emphasis on administration to outweigh the emphasis on education.[27] The interdisciplinary approach to the training of educational administration which was strong in the 1950s took the field toward the social sciences and away from direct contact with curriculum, educational foundations and educational psychology. A generic view of administration was persuasive and still continues to influence the definition of the field of study. Although some educational administration programs are now more closely related to other areas within education, the dominant orientation has undergone little change.

The interpretation which has been provided prompts the question of what directions should the education of administrators in Canada take in the future. Is the slow pace of acceptance of the preservice preparation model appropriate? Should there be more rapid development in the implementation of a certification requirement? Or is there some unintended and intuitive wisdom present in the relatively cautious approach which is being taken to mandating administrator preparation? We would, of course, like to believe that at least a small element of the latter is at the basis of present practice.

Reflections

Reflecting upon the evolution and state of the art of university-based administrator preparation in Canada -- or, for

that matter, administrator preparation in general -- once again raises broad and complex questions. As we reawaken our senses to the complexity and diversity of the undertaking, those of us who occupy and define the field are confronted by questions which have significant ontological, epistemological and pedagogical implications: Do we really mean preparation? Preparation for what purpose? Preparation in what sense? Preparation in what setting? Preparation of and for whom? Perhaps in the face of such questions and of diversity such as that which exists in settings like Canada, we might be well advised to seek multiple approaches to understanding administration and the education of administrators.

In order to develop a broadly-based perspective on educating administrators, we shall turn for general guidance to the four paradigmatic viewpoints developed by Burrell and Morgan.[28] Intriguingly, these authors indicate that their efforts to make sense out of the confusion within the social sciences resulted in their achieving a "way of seeing" social theory and thinking about its implications.[29] Perhaps their vision may help us to catch a glimpse of alternative ways of viewing questions about the education of administrators. Before we turn to the insights which the paradigms might yield on this particular issue, we will present a brief overview of the perspective.[30]

Alternative Paradigms

Using a model-building process which is not unfamiliar in our field, Burrell and Morgan based their analysis on a two-by-

two matrix formed by the intersection of two continua. The horizontal axis represents a continuum of assumptions about the nature of the social world. One extreme represents a perspective in social science which assumes the existence of a concrete world external to the observer. Research orientations at this end of the continuum involve a scientific, objective, nomothetic approach to gaining knowledge about the social world. The opposite end of the continuum represents a subjectivist approach to understanding a world which is socially constructed. In terms of research, perspectives at this end of the continuum are concerned with the value-laden ideographic nature of knowledge which suggests that understanding depends very much on the nature of the subject, emerging through the very processes of inquiry.

The upper extreme of the vertical axis represents a social science which is concerned with the dynamics of the social world, with such matters as radical change, structural conflict, contradiction, and modes of domination. The other extreme represents approaches to sociology based upon a concern for matters which sustain social order, regulation, cohesion and social integration.

On the basis of these two dimensions, then, the authors posit four paradigmatic viewpoints: functionalist, interpretive, radical structuralist and radical humanist. The former, which is oriented toward an objectivist view of the world and a concern for regularity, is generally accepted as reflecting the dominant orientation in social science; consequently, this is also the perspective which characterizes most of organizational and administrative theory. The alternative paradigms which are

oriented toward more subjectivist or change orientations have attracted only a limited interest in the field.[31]

We will attempt to apply Burrell and Morgan's conceptualization to administrator preparation or education. The line of reasoning is as follows. Each of the four paradigms -- functionalist, interpretive, radical structuralist, radical humanist -- suggests a concept of organization which has at least some distinctive characteristics.[32] In turn, each concept of organization suggests a particular concept of administration or of administrators and their relationship to the social world. Further, the preferred type or kind of knowledge on which to base the practice of administration can be inferred from each of the concepts of administration. Finally, the knowledge base would seem to hold certain implications for the education of the administrator.

Our line of analysis will be pursued in two stages. First, we will derive a concept of administration from a statement on the concept of organization. Second, we will make some inferences about administrator education on the basis of a presumed knowledge base. The first stage is summarized in Figure 1.

Organization and Administration

Within the functionalist paradigm, organizations are viewed as real entities in a real world; they have an objective existence like other naturally-occuring phenomena. Either mechanistic or organismic metaphors are used in thinking of organizations as the means by which collectivities achieve

	CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONS	CONCEPT OF ADMINISTRATION
FUNCTIONALIST	- real entities in a real world - means for attaining goals through collective action - definable structures - universalistic characteristics - shaped by external and internal forces	- designing structures and processes - establishing means-ends chains - satisfying organizational needs - achieving effectiveness and efficiency - controlling - performing a role
INTERPRETIVE	- subjective creation - shared mental constructs - formed and reformed through interaction - consequence of human intentionality	- facilitating involvement of others - defining shared values - communicating intentions and meanings - participating in creating the organization - living in a social context
RADICAL STRUCTURALIST	- real entities in a real social structure - internal class structure - replication of external structure - differential distribution of power - oppressors and oppressed - differential access to resources	- acting to bring about fundamental change - transforming social structures - eliminating oppression - dispersing power - using crises to achieve desired ends
RADICAL HUMANIST	- process of individual intention and action - organizing rather than organization - shared consciousness - serving personal, human ends	- liberating and emancipating - developing human potential - transforming through reflecting and acting - living

Figure 1. Concepts of Organizations and Administration

predetermined common goals. Organizations have definable structures which are shaped by both internal and external forces. A strong belief in universalism pervades the development of knowledge about the nature of organizations. In keeping with the emphasis on order and regularity, the tasks of administrators revolve around designing organizational structures and directing organizational processes in order to accomplish the mission of the organization. Administrators establish rational means-end chains, satisfy organizational needs, and strive to achieve efficiency and effectiveness. The dynamic underlying administration is performing a role; the primary objective of the administrator is control.[33]

In contrast to the preceding perspective, within the interpretive paradigm organizations have no objective existence. Instead, the phenomena to which we give the name organizations are the consequences of subjective creations of individuals.[34] The shared constructs of organization are constantly being created and re-created through the process of social interaction. At the base of this human interaction are intentional acts. The essence of organizations resides in the meanings which individuals assign to their actions and to those of others. Consequently, our understanding of organizations and of organizational life varies with individual meanings and the extent to which these are shared. The universalism of the functionalist paradigm is replaced by an intersubjective particularism. This concept of organization leads to a concept of administration in which the administrator may be viewed as a

partner in the creation of organizational meaning. To the extent that administration is differentiated from other activities, in the idealized setting the administrator makes important contributions to defining shared values, to communicating and explicating meanings, and to facilitating the involvement of others in activities from which organization emerges. In contrast to the functionalist paradigm, when viewed from an interpretive perspective the administrator is seen as existing within a social context rather than performing a role.

The radical structuralist perspective, like functionalism, views organizations as real entities but places more emphasis on their linkages with society in general. Organizations are part of a differentiated class structure and, in turn, are characterized by internal class divisions. The class divisions are related intimately to differential distributions of power and to differentials in access to resources; organizations are composed of "oppressors" and of the "oppressed." From the perspective of the emergent administrator within the radical structuralist framework, administration is acting to bring about significant change, transforming social structures, and equalizing access to power. Major objectives of the administrator-change agents include eliminating oppression and using crises to bring about desired changes.[35]

In keeping with a basic interpretive orientation, within the radical humanist paradigm organizations are viewed as being socially created and sustained. However, the notion of "organizing" through individual action is more appropriate than is "organization" for describing the phenomenon. Although

"organization" serves human ends, it does so imperfectly. The imperfection results in an alienation of persons from the activities in which they engage. Over time organization, as shared consciousness, tends to become reified and to dominate the individual. The major task of "administrators" is to reduce or eliminate the alienation, that is, to reveal the "constructed" nature of what we take as social "reality." Administrators attempt to liberate and to emancipate individuals from the constraints of a world which they all have labored to create. Administrators may aptly be thought of as "teachers" who help others to understand the human condition and to develop human potential. They transform relationships between and among people through reflection and active involvement in shared activities. Neither the "administrator" role nor the person is clearly distinct from others in the organization. Administration and the conduct of daily life are reciprocal activities.[36]

Insofar as these paradigms generate or imply alternative notions of administration, differences may be identified in the knowledge on which administrative practice might be based.[37] Some implications may then be inferred for the substance and process of administrator education. These ideas are summarized in Figure 2.

Administrative Knowledge and Education

Within the functionalist perspective, administrators must have expertise in the science of management. Ideally, they should be knowledgeable about the universal truths which govern the operation of organizations and should be able to model the

	PRACTICE KNOWLEDGE BASE	EDUCATION IMPLICATIONS
FUNCTIONALIST	- expertise in universal management science - general truths which undergird regularities - modelling operation of organizations - social science - measurement - statistics and probability - predicting consequences of alternative actions	- Timing: preservice and refreshers - Setting: institutional - Process: didactic - Content: banked knowledge; theory and science of administration; application of positivistic social science
INTERPRETIVE	- personal and practical - intuitive and empathetic - understanding of sense making and negotiation - how organizations are created and sustained - process of deriving meanings	- Timing: lifelong and inservice - Setting: institutional and field - Process: interactive - Content: shared meanings; direct experience; variety of settings; arts and humanities
RADICAL STRUCTURALIST	- understand organization in social and historical context - critique contemporary social order - theories of fundamental change - perspective of the oppressed	- Timing: lifelong but intermittent - Setting: alternative or anti-institutional - Process: critical reflection and action - Content: historical analysis of society; political, economic and social theory; experience as "worker" and study
RADICAL HUMANIST	- personal and particular - praxis - critical theory - dialectical processes - transcendant consciousness	- Timing: ongoing -- living is learning - Setting: social milieu - Process: self-directed; reflection about practice - Content: inter- and anti-disciplinary; generalist; humanities; spiritual

Figure 2. Implications for Administrator Education

organization in order to predict the consequences of alternative courses of action. Administrators inhabit a statistical and probabilistic domain; they must be able to engage in social engineering in order to achieve given ends. Clearly, the source of this knowledge is the study of the science of administration which, to a large extent, is based upon positivistic social science. Both the theorist and the practitioner are confronted by the challenge of applying this knowledge to practice. In order to acquire the necessary knowledge, pre-service preparation and periodic inservice education are required. The logical setting for this training is an educational institution within which "banked" knowledge is transmitted, usually through a didactic process.[38]

Administrators within the interpretive paradigm base their practice on a definition of knowledge which emphasizes the development of understanding. The understanding comes from having an empathy for others and from knowing intuitively and through thoughtful reflection how others make sense of their experience. At best, only the process for examining how organizations are given form, not how and what organizations are in an objective sense, can be learned. Consequently, the education of the administrator should be oriented toward approaches for developing an understanding of how organizations come into being and are sustained. The ability to interpret how meanings are developed through negotiation and communicated through symbols are particularly important. Administrators can become educated through experience in a wide variety of settings,

both administrative and non-administrative, both institutional and field. Intensive interaction with others is necessary; some insights can also come from engagement with the arts and the humanities.[39] Becoming educated as an administrator is a lifelong process. The importance of personal characteristics which are difficult to learn suggests that selection may be more significant than "training" in the process of determining who becomes an administrator. Of course, the challenge then shifts to identifying situationally appropriate selection criteria and sustaining a reasonable level of reflective engagement in the activities of administering.

From the radical structuralist perspective, administrators need to have an understanding of organizations in their historical and social context.[40] In particular, they need to have the perspective of the oppressed and not of the dominant class. Their actions must reflect a sense of solidarity with the dominated. Administrators must sustain an ability to critique the contemporary social order and must understand the theory of how fundamental structural change can be brought about. In order to achieve this understanding, a study of political theory is essential. Studies of social and economic theory will have political overtones, in the sense that they will be critical and oriented toward change. Administrator education will take place largely within social settings and alternative or anti-institutional contexts. The learning process would probably involve work experience, study and reflection. The period of education would probably be lifelong but may be intermittent.

The knowledge base for administration in the radical

humanist paradigm rests on the concept of praxis -- on the melding of theory and practice.[41] Knowledge is personal, particular and grounded in the concrete; it is understood to be the result of critical and dialectical processes. An understanding of how social life can be transformed through changes in consciousness is particularly important. Learning can be largely self-directed and grounded in reflection about practice. Although disciplines such as philosophy and theology can be part of the formal education, the orientation would be interdisciplinary or anti-disciplinary and grounded in life itself. A human-centered approach would be based broadly in human experience and the interpretation of that experience. The essence of the education of the administrator can best be captured by the notion that "living is learning."[42]

Conclusion

The analysis in which we have just engaged speaks to both the form and the substance of administrator preparation. Insofar as the form is concerned, formalized preservice training or preparation emerges most clearly within a functionalist paradigm. Although the other paradigms accommodate various forms of education, the emphasis on a formalized program preceding the practice of administration seems to be reduced. Study following or paralleling practice is readily compatible with the alternative paradigms. Insofar as these paradigms reflect views of the world in which administrators find themselves, they support alternative approaches to becoming educated as an administrator. The perspective speaks against a narrow

conception of administrator education which is grounded in a particular approach. Instead, the alternatives suggest various possibilities for the preparation of educational administrators. In addition, they offer suggestions as to how university-based programs might become enriched, not just by incorporating alternative paradigmatic perspectives, but also by following through with the implications which those perspectives hold for educating administrators.

We return to our questions about the state of administrator preparation in Canada. The analysis presented in this paper suggests no great cause for alarm in the slow pace at which the study of administration has been adopted as a prerequisite for appointment as an administrator. On the contrary, the analysis suggests that administrator preparation policy may have been following the "right" path. Perhaps some collective wisdom may be in operation; perhaps theory has lagged behind practice. Regardless of the reasons, those responsible for educational administration programs might be well-advised to clarify their intentions and to design programs in accordance with the distinctive characteristic of the social context rather than to assume that there are universalistic forces at work which dictate the particular form and nature of administrator education.[43] Perhaps relevance of administrator education programs to the cultural and historical context should be more compelling than adherence to a particular professional ideology.

Notes

1. The nature of educational administration programs in the early 1970s is described perceptively in A. R. Thomas, "The Preparation of Educational Administrators in Canadian Universities: Laying on of the Hands," The Journal of Educational Administration 13,1(May 1975): 35-60.

2. See, for example, T. B. Greenfield, "Theory about Organizations: A New Perspective and its Implications for Schools," in Administering Schools: International Challenge, M. Hughes, ed.(London: The Athlone Press of the University of London, 1975), pp. 71-79; C. Hodgkinson, "The Failure of Organizational and Administrative Theory," McGill Journal of Education 13(Fall 1978): 271-278; C. Deblois, "Challenge to Administrative Theory," The Canadian Administrator 18(May 1979): 1-6.

3. For a succinct description of the context of educational administration, see C. Hodgkinson, "Educational Administration in Canada: A Conspectus," School Organization and Management Abstracts 1,2(1982): 61-67.

4. A description of these events and of the initiation of university-based programs for the study of educational administration is presented in W. H. Swift, Educational Administration in Canada: A Memorial to A. W. Reeves(Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada, 1970).

5. Ibid., p. 14.

6. Three regional conferences were also held in Quebec in 1954, 1955 and 1956.

7. The history of the course is outlined in Canadian Education Association, Leadership in Action: The CEA Short Course 1953-1977 (Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1977).

8. Swift, op. cit., p. 25.

9. Thomas, op. cit., p. 49, reported that in 1973 only one of the twelve departments which he visited did not have a graduate of the University of Alberta as a faculty member.

10. For an overview of the nature of preparation programs see E. A. Holdaway, "Educational Administration in Canada: Concerns, Research, and Preparation Programs," in Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration, R. H. Farquhar and I. E. Housego, eds.(Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1980), pp. 16-38.

11. The preparation of administrators is given only limited attention by school districts. See, for example, J. G. T. Kelsey and B. Leullier, "School District Policies for the Identification, Selection and Training of Principals," The Canadian Administrator 17,5(February 1978): 1-6.

12. D. B. Duncan, "Policy Recommendations Regarding Educational Administration in Alberta" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1985).

13. In spite of the apparently minimal requirements, the majority of superintendents in all provinces probably hold a Master's degree which will include at least some studies in educational administration. See, for example, E. M. Carlin and D. J. Brown, Careers and Issues: A Survey of the Superintendency (Vancouver: Department of Administrative, Adult and Higher Education, University of British Columbia, 1985). An earlier study found that a substantial proportion of superintendents aspire to complete doctoral studies: L. W. Downey Research Associates, The School Superintendency in Alberta: A Report of an Inquiry(Edmonton: L. W. Downey Research Associates, 1976).

14. The certification issue does surface from time to time. See, for example, P. Renihan, "Certification for Principals -- Weighing the Pros and Cons," The Canadian School Executive 4(June 1984): 3-6.

15. For a description and discussion of these issues see E. D. Hodgson, Federal Intervention in Public Education (Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1976).

16. For an overview of the force of language, religion and other elements of culture on education see, for example, E. B. Titley and P. J. Miller, eds., Education in Canada: An Interpretation (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, 1982).

17. The potential influence of superintendents on educational policy was investigated in a recent study: M. A. Awender, "The Superintendent-School Board Relationship," Canadian Journal of Education 10(Spring 1985): 176-198.

18. In part, the "memory" both exists as and is reflected in popular literature. For an analysis of this literature see, for example, J. E. Oster, "The Image of the Teacher in Canadian Prairie Fiction: 1921-1971 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1972); and R. R. Rust, "The Image of the Teacher as Reflected in Selected Novels of the Prairie Provinces"(Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1972).

19. T. Fleming, "The Changing Character of the Superintendency and its Implications for Policy-Making," Policy Explorations 2(Fall 1985): 1-4.

20. The nature of school administration and the process of becoming an administrator are captured effectively in reminiscences of educators of the day. See, for example. R. G. McIntosh and R. C. Bryce, "Conversations with Tim Byrne: Reflections of Education in Alberta," Challenge in Educational Administration 15(Nos. 3 & 4 1977): 7-107; and, H. W. Hodysh and R. G. McIntosh, "Conversations with a Dean: The Life and Times of H. T. Coutts," Challenge in Educational Administration 21(No. 4 1982): 7-192.

21. The protracted process of bringing about improvements in teacher preparation programs is described in R. S. Patterson, "History of Teacher Education in Alberta," in Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West, D. C. Jones, N. M. Sheehan, and R. M. Stamp, eds. (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, 1979), pp. 192-207.

22. There have been some critiques of the discrepancies between the orientation of programs and the needs of clients. See, for example, D. Pratt and R. Common, "The Miseducation of Canadian Educational Administrators," The Canadian Administrator 25(February 1986): 1-8.; also C. Hodgkinson, "A Practical Program for Preparing Administrators," Education Canada 2,1(March 1971): 19-21. For evidence that relevance has been of long-standing concern to professors, see Thomas, op. cit., pp.39-44.

23. For a discussion of issues based in economic factors, demographics and values see, for example, T. R. Williams, Leadership Issues for Canadian Education (Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1979). Some of the challenges of multiculturalism to community relationships, planning and teaching are outlined in K. C. Sullivan, "The Challenge of Multiculturalism: Perspectives for School Principals," McGill Journal of Education 19(Fall 1984): 293-304. The impact of declining enrolments has been discussed in numerous reports and studies such as M. Crespo and J. B. Hache, Gestion et decroisance en education: Le cas d'une commission scolaire Quebecoise (Montreal: Les Presses de l'Universite de Montreal, 1983).

24. A rationale for greater decentralization is presented in P. Coleman, "Improving Schools by School-Based Management," McGill Journal of Education 19(Winter 1984): 25-43.

25. For a discussion of the problem of reconciling the perspectives of practitioners and academics see F. Enns, "Prospects for Reconciliation and Synthesis of Current Conceptualizations in Educational Administration"(Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, University of Guelph, June 2, 1984). On the need for reforming preparation programs see P. Coleman, "Administrative Leadership, Change, and Training Programs for Administrators," Canadian Journal of Education 7(No. 1 1982): 44-58.

26. For a collection of essays in which are presented a variety of perspectives on the question of uniqueness see R. G. Townsend and S. B. Lawton, eds., What's So Canadian about Canadian Educational Administration (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1981). For an overview of the Canadian contributuion to educational administration see Hodgkinson, "Educational Administration in Canada: A Conspectus."

27. On the need for relating administrator preparation to developments in education and for differentiating the preparation of educational administrators from that of public administrators, see C. Deblois and J. Moisett, "La preparation des administrateurs scolaires dans le Quebec des annees 1980," Revue canadienne d'education de langue francaise 12,1(1983): 8-16.

28. G. Burrell and G. Morgan, Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis (London:Heinemann, 1979).

29. Ibid., p. vii.

30. The Burrell and Morgan analysis has been used by others to examine the current state of theorizing about organizations in educational administration. See, in particular, D. E. Griffiths, "Theories: Past, Present and Future" (Paper presented at the International Intervisitation Program, Nigeria, August, 1982); and, D. E. Griffiths, "Evolution in Research and Theory: A Study of Prominent Researchers," Educational Administration Quarterly 19,3(Summer 1983): 201-221. However, the implications of the paradigmatic perspective for the education of administrators do not appear to have been explored to any significant extent.

31. For an analysis of the impact of the dominant view of organizations on educational administration, and also for an overview of an alternative perspective, see T. B. Greenfield, "Theories of Educational Organization: A Critical Perpsective," International Encyclopedia of Education: Research and Studies (Oxford:Pergamon Press, 1985), pp. 5240-5251.

32. Variations within perspectives or paradigms will be set aside for purposes of this analysis. Although we have attempted to remain consistent with the Burrell and Morgan conceptualization, readers are cautioned that some distortions may have resulted from the need to compress the discussion.

33. The view of administration as a "techonology of control" is described and critiqued effectively in R. Bates, Educational Administration and the Management of Knowledge. ESA841 Theory and Practice in Educational Administration (Victoria: Deakin University Press, 1983).

34. An interpretive approach to understanding organizations is central to the alternative proposed by Greenfield in his various papers. See, for example, his "Theory about Organizations: A New Perspective and its Implications for Schools"; also, T. B. Greenfield, "Leaders and Schools: Willfulness and Nonnatural Order in Organizations," in Leadership and Organizational Culture, T. J. Sergiovanni and J. E. Corbally, eds.(Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), pp. 142-169.

35. For contrasting views about the potential contribution of a radical structuralist approach to studying educational administration see R. Bates, "A Marxist Theory of Educational Administration?" (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, March-April, 1985; and D. J. Willower, "Marxian Critical Theory and Educational Administration: A Criticism," (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, March-April, 1985). See, also J. K. Benson, "Organizations: A Dialectical View," Administrative Science Quarterly 22(March 1977): 1-21.

36. The distinction between radical structuralist and radical humanist critiques of mainstream theorizing in educational administration is not always clear to us; there seems to be a blurring of the two perspectives. Although a clearly radical humanist perspective remains to be articulated, some important pioneering work was reported a decade ago in C. Deblois, "An Emerging Model of Organization Based on the Literature of Liberation" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1976).

37. The difficulties which uncertainties about the knowledge base for administrative practice create for preparation programs usually surface in discussions about the nature of such programs. See, for example, J. Hills, "Critical Issues in the Preparation of Educational Administrators in North America," in Farquhar and Housego, Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration, pp. 224-235; and, M. G. Hughes, "Critical Issues in the Preparation of Educational Administrators in Britain," in Farquhar and Housego, pp. 236-244.

38. The limitations of mainstream approaches to educating or preparing educational administrators have been discussed thoroughly by T. B. Greenfield. See, for example, his "Can Science Guide the Administrator's Hand? A Critique of the †New Movement' Ideology in Educational Administration" (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Universite du Quebec a Montreal, June, 1980); also, T. B. Greenfield, " Research in Educational Administration in the United States and Canada: An Overview and a Critique," Educational Administration 8,1(Winter 1980): 207-245.

39. Indeed, in the views of some scholars the "engagement" with the humanities should be central to the study of administration. The case for the centrality of philosophical analyses has been made effectively in C. Hodgkinson, Towards a Philosophy of Administration(Oxford: Blackwell, 1978); and C. Hodgkinson, The Philosophy of Leadership(Oxford: Blackwell, 1983).

40. The basis for developing these understandings is reflected in the content of P. Watkins, Class, Control, and Contestation in Educational Organizations. ESA841 Theory and Practice in Educational Administration (Victoria: Deakin University Press, 1983).

41. The concept of praxis, which is a key aspect of critical theory, appears to be grounded in both the radical structuralist and the radical humanist perspectives. Although praxis may be the major theme in a critical analysis, an understanding of the concept may be taken for granted as in W. P. Foster, " The Changing Administrator: Developing Managerial Praxis," Educational Theory 30,1(Winter 1980): 11-23. For a view on the possibility of praxis in another setting see R. B. Denhardt and K. G. Denhardt, "Public Administration and the Critique of Domination," Administration and Society 11,1(May 1979): 107-120. The reflection-in-action perspective also would seem to be relevant; see, for example, T. J. Sergiovanni, "Landscapes, Mindscapes, and Reflective Practice in Supervision," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 1,1(Fall 1985): 5-17.

42. The view of administrator preparation as "training for life" has been developed effectively in T. B. Greenfield, "The Man Who Comes Back through the Door in the Wall: Discovering Truth, Discovering Self, Discovering Organizations, " Educational Administration Quarterly 16,3(Fall 1980): 26-59.

43. Support for this view is implicit in M. Holmes, "The Revival of Traditional Thought and its Effects on Educational Administration: The Case of Decision Making" (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Universite de Montreal, June 1985).